

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

FRANK PISCIOTTI,

Plaintiff,

v.

ROBERTA BRITTINGHAM,

Defendant.

CASE NO. 20-CV-05924-LK

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR
CLARIFICATION

Before the Court is Plaintiff Frank Piscioti's Motion for Clarification on Summary Judgment Order. Dkt. No. 67. He asks the Court "to clarify that its Order applies only to Defendant's actions of infringement that were the subject matter of this case," and to further specify that "the [O]rder does not affect Plaintiff's remedies for any acts of infringement that occur after July 1, 2022." *Id.* at 1. The Court declines to do so, as its Order speaks for itself. *See, e.g.*, Dkt. No. 65 at 2 ("Piscioti's ownership claim and—by extension—any infringement claims are . . . time-barred.") (citing *Seven Arts Filmed Ent. Ltd. v. Content Media Corp. PLC*, 733 F.3d 1251, 1258 (9th Cir. 2013)); *see also id.* at 28. Piscioti's motion is accordingly denied. *See O'Donnell/Salvatori Inc. v. Microsoft Corp.*, No. C20-882-MLP, 2021 WL 4948188, at *1 (W.D.

1 Wash. Oct. 22, 2021) (denying motion for clarification where “[t]here was no ambiguity in the
2 Court’s ruling”).

3 Dated this 6th day of September, 2022.

4 

5 Lauren King
6 United States District Judge
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24